

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARREN HARRIS,
Plaintiff,
v.
KIM , et al.,
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:05-cv-00003-AWI-SKO PC
ORDER DENYING MOTION REGARDING
TRIAL PROCEDURE
(Doc. 100)

Plaintiff Darren Harris, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on January 3, 2005. On September 12, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking to be fully informed on the exact manner in which trial will be conducted, including the introduction of evidence.

At this juncture, this action has not been set for trial. If this matter goes to trial, Plaintiff will be transported to the Fresno Division of the Eastern District of California for trial and the trial judge will, at that time, inform Plaintiff as is necessary regarding the proceedings. However, while Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and is entitled to some leniency as a result, the Court cannot and will not act as substitute counsel for Plaintiff. See Piller v. Ford, 5452 U.S. 225, 231, 124 S.Ct. 2441, 2446 (2004) (“District judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to pro se litigants.”)

///

///

///

///

///

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff's motion is HEREBY DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 28, 2012

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE